VOLUME VII MAY, 1921 NUMBER 5

BULLETIN

OF

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

CARNEGIE FOUNDATION

PUBLISHED BY
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
222 CHARLES RIVER ROAD
CAMBRIDGE
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

General Announcements
- Annual Meeting 3
- American Council on Education 3
- An Encouraging Example 5
- École des Hautes Études Musicales 5
- British Academic Credentials 6

Council Business
- Conduct of Annual Meeting 7

Notes from Committees
- A, Academic Freedom: Colorado School of Mines 10
- B, Methods of Appointment and Promotion 18
- D, Vocational Education 18
- G, Intellectual Interests 18
- P, Pensions and Insurance 18
- R, Encouragement of University Research 20

Local Branches
- Officers Elected 23
- Circular Note 23
- University of Chicago 24
- Ohio State University 24
- Smith College 25
- Union College 26

Report on Middlebury College 28

Recent Educational Discussion
- Annual Report of President Hadley 38
- Association of American Universities 41
- The Dilemma of the College 45
- Washburn College 47
- Annual Report of Carnegie Foundation 48

Membership
- Members Elected 55
- Nominations for Membership 56

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

After June 10th, the address of the Secretary will be Faculty Club, Berkeley, Calif., until July 30. Matters of routine, however, will be taken care of at Cambridge.

ANNUAL MEETING.—The Council having referred the determination of the place of the next annual meeting to the Executive Committee, the Executive Committee has voted that the meeting be held in connection with the annual meetings of the American Economic and Political Science Associations, which are expected to be in Pittsburgh near the end of December. A discussion of various matters in connection with the annual meeting will be found on a later page of this issue.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION.—The Educational Record for April, 1921, contains a statistical summary of the referendum conducted by the Council on a Federal Department of Education. The most important indications of opinion appear to be the following:

1. An overwhelming majority of the membership of the Council voting favors the creation of a department of education.
2. An almost equally large majority of the Council's membership believes that the Smith-Towner bill should be amended.
3. The amendment most generally favored is one providing for the inclusion of the Federal Board for Vocational Education in a new department from the outset.
4. Opinion is nearly evenly divided on the advisability of large Federal appropriations to the States on condition that the States match the appropriations.
5. A considerable majority favor the appointment of an advisory council by the Department of Education.

The Smith-Towner bill itself has lapsed with the outgoing Congress. A revised bill of the same general character has been since introduced, but apparently has less chance of favorable action than the new Administration Bill (Senate 1607), providing for a Department of Public Welfare, and including as its

main divisions, Education, Public Health, Social Service, and Veteran Relief.

The American Council voted to adhere to its preference for a separate department of education and not to endorse the bill for a Department of Public Welfare.

The annual meeting was held at Washington, May 6 and 7, with a good attendance. The meeting was devoted mainly to discussion of standardizing and accrediting methods and agencies, leading up to the adoption of the following recommendations:

I. The Committee recommends that this conference approve the formulation of common statements of standards of higher educational institutions of the whole country—colleges, technological institutions, junior colleges, and institutions primarily for the training of teachers, for the following reasons:

   1. To remedy the existing diversity of standards and statements among standardizing agencies, and the confusion arising therefrom.
   2. To supply the lack of such statements in certain sections of the country.
   3. To aid associations and institutions now compelled to deal with students from all parts of the United States, and also State departments of education dealing with certification of teachers.

II. It recommends that the Council request the U.S. Bureau of Education to publish at once a full statement of the present standards of the chief accrediting agencies now active, and a tabulation of the institutions accredited by these agencies.

III. It recommends that the Council transmit from this conference to these agencies suggested unified statements of standards for various types of institutions, for discussion and report as to the possibility of the adoption of such statements by these agencies within the next two years, such unified statements to be drafted by a committee to be appointed by the Council, from the chief accrediting agencies.

IV. It recommends that the conference approve the unification of the present lists by the same committee as soon as these various agencies can be brought into accord in the matter of common statements of minimum standards.

V. It recommends that the Council serve as the coordinating agency for further conference, for formulation and for dissemination of definite common standards, and for promoting the unification here approved.

AN ENCOURAGING EXAMPLE.—

APRIL 22, 1921.

TO THE SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY,

Dear Sir,—I wish you would ask the Faculty whether in their judgment it might not be well to have a thorough conference with the President and the Trustees about the various functions, privileges, and duties of the Trustees, the President, the Dean, and the Faculty; about whether or not the Faculty might well be represented by someone of their own choosing on the Board of Trustees; about whether or not the Faculty ought to elect their own Dean and have a voice in the selection of their President; about whether or not the election or removal of a member of the Faculty ought to be subject to the veto of the Faculty; about the procedure whereby a man becomes a Professor with indeterminate tenure; about whether or not the Faculty should have a voice in the making of the budget; about whether or not the granting of honorary degrees should be a thing in which the Faculty should be consulted; and about other similar matters.

There are at present no recognized and official rules in these matters. We are living under an unwritten law which puts, in my judgment, entirely too much responsibility and power into the hands of the President. I try to administer things sanely and with due regard for the opinion of the Faculty; but there is at present nothing to ensure against dire results in case another President, or I myself, should lose balance and get arbitrary.

If the Faculty thinks that such matters need attention, I suggest that they write the Board between the date of the May Faculty meeting and the fifteenth of that month, requesting that these matters may be considered jointly by a committee of the Trustees, a committee from the Faculty, and the President.

Yours most sincerely,

(Signed) ———— ————

President.

ÉCOLE DES HAUTES ÉTUDES MUSICALES.—A school of music for advanced American students has been established in Fontainebleau, under the control of the French Government.

Instruction, at first, will be given only during the three months of the summer session. If the undertaking proves successful the duration of the curriculum each year will be extended. The

hope is expressed that the institution will also develop into a school of painting, architecture, and sculpture.

BRITISH ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS.—A Committee of the American Council on Education makes the following recommendations:

"1. That students or graduates of Canadian institutions who are candidates for admission to undergraduate or graduate standing at colleges and universities in the United States be classified for purposes of admission as if they had studied at American higher institutions.

"2. That holders of the bachelor's degree from universities in England, Wales, and Ireland, and holders of the master's degree from universities in Scotland (the M.A. is the first degree at Scottish universities), be admitted to graduate registration in American universities, the status of each individual with reference to candidacy for a higher degree to be determined by the merits of his case.

"3. That holders of the bachelor's degree from universities in Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa and from government universities in India be admitted to graduate registration in American universities, the status of each individual with reference to candidacy for a higher degree to be determined by the merits of his case.

"4. That administrative officers should note that many holders of the bachelor's degree from institutions mentioned in paragraphs 2 and 3 may need to spend at least two years in preparation for the master's degree at an American university. But men who have graduated with high honors from universities in the British Isles and from some of the institutions noted in paragraph 3 will ordinarily proceed to the master's degree at an American institution in the minimum period."

COUNCIL BUSINESS

CONDUCT OF ANNUAL MEETING.—The following circular letter has been sent to 114 delegates and others attending the annual meeting at Chicago:

Dear Sir:

The recent annual meeting was the first held under the delegate system. The officers are anxious in planning future meetings to profit as much as possible from the experience of this one and therefore invite replies from delegates and other members to the following questions:

1. Did you regard the recent meeting as on the whole satisfactory?
2. What suggestions for improvement would you make either in regard to the program or the conduct of the meeting?
3. Would you favor trying a meeting at a different season independently of meetings of larger societies, with the expectation that sufficient attendance would be secured by the sending of subsidized delegates by local branches?
4. Does it seem to you possible that larger representation of local branches and more effective sessions can be secured by an effort to have local branches provide traveling expenses?
5. At the recent meeting such votes as were taken were mostly unanimous, and controversial questions were discussed without action. Does it seem to you desirable and practicable that a different policy should be pursued under which such controversial matters would be settled (?) by a proportional ballot of delegates who happen to be present at the session in question? (At the Chicago meeting 35 institutions were represented by 65 delegates. The total number of institutions having local branches is 65, the total number having members is 168.)

E. R. A. SELIGMAN, *President.*
H. W. TYLER, *Secretary.*

Replies have been received from 58 persons, including many interesting and valuable suggestions. A study of the replies indicates that about two-thirds of the writers consider the recent meeting satisfactory. Suggestions for improvement connect themselves mainly with the importance of attendance on the part of committee chairmen, or substitutes; of publication of reports in advance of the meeting, and of the more careful preparation of topics for discussion. The reading of extended reports is deprecated. The discussion was often diffuse and rambling. Some writers urge the desirability of avoiding conflicts

with other meetings, but this is, in the judgment of the officers, a wish for the unattainable. The response to the suggestion of a meeting of subsidized delegates at a different season is too limited to justify the experiment, and the replies seem not to indicate that much can be expected in the way of financial cooperation by local branches. The replies to the question in regard to formulated expressions of opinion naturally vary widely and seem to represent divergent conceptions of the aims and purposes of the Association,—perhaps also in a measure temperamental differences among the writers themselves. In this connection it may be noted that the constitution defines the objects of the Association as follows:

> Its object shall be to facilitate a more effective cooperation among teachers and investigators in universities and colleges and in professional schools of similar grade for the promotion of the interests of higher education and research, and in general to increase the usefulness and advance the standards and ideals of the profession.

One group of writers believes that it would be possible to formulate large questions of constitutional policy in such a way that a vote on them at the annual meeting of the Association should be generally accepted as representing the opinion of the profession. A majority, on the other hand, seemed to be convinced that such "decisions" would have little importance or validity and that the annual meeting of the Association is to be regarded rather as a "committee of the whole" which affords opportunity for exchange of views in a representative professional group, but that decisions should be left either to a general referendum of the whole membership of the Association or to the independent action of each local branch, such action of course having no force except for the particular institution.

The following quotations are of special interest:

"My own view continues to be:

"1. That a national association of 3,500 members can *never* have a truly *representative* annual meeting.

"2. That therefore those issues upon which the public opinion of the Association is worth recording, for the sake of its influence upon the University world, should be submitted to a vote by *mail.*

"3. That for the formulation of the Association's opinion and

vote a much larger use than now should be made of the mail during the year.

"4. That for the same purpose, every committee should be *required* to conclude its report with one or more propositions framed for submission to mail vote of the Association.

"5. That the methods used by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce at Washington, in formulating the public opinion of its 6,000 membership, be studied and employed."

"I think the principle governing the making of the program of the meeting should be this: the meeting should be devoted to such matters as could not equally well be cared for in committee or by publication in the BULLETIN. The main function of the meeting, I take it, is to serve as a place for discussion by men who would not otherwise be likely to come to know each other's views. Thus I do not believe that the presentation of a final committee report falls properly within the scope of a program. On the other hand, so long as the work of a committee is in tentative shape, discussion of the main problems of the committee would be welcome and valuable. I should suggest that the call for the meeting contain on behalf of each active committee a brief, tentative report containing a briefly annotated list of matters which the committee would like to hear discussed at the annual meeting. This same printed material should be placed in the hands of all attending the meeting. The time of the meeting could then be used effectively in discussion."

"It seems to me quite clear that the business of the Association must be done by a small working body, using some kind of machinery by which the expression of local groups could be secured. I doubt if delegates could be subsidized by local branches to attend the general meeting, unless the Association enters upon a very large and definite program. I can, of course, appreciate the difficulties inherent in such a policy. It may, moreover, seem quite ungracious for me to intimate in any way anything but appreciation of the very valuable work accomplished during these first years of the Association's existence."

A communication from the Union College Local Branch (see page 26) has been presented to the Council.

NOTES FROM COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE A (ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE)

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES.—The somewhat acrimonious controversy which has grown out of the report on this institution published in the BULLETIN of May, 1920, has had interesting and important developments, culminating in a report by a legislative committee from which the following extracts are taken:

". . . Your Committee finds many opinions as to the efficiency or inefficiency of the school, but from personal observation and inspection of the institution, and personal contact with the student body, also through other sources of information that have come to us in our investigation, we have found that at this time the school is in excellent physical and moral condition, with the exceptions of a few physical defects in the Experimental Mill and Hall of Engineering.

"The Experimental Mill has never been completed and has apparently been neglected for lack of funds and interest taken, but we believe it can be and should be put in good condition, and is capable of being made of real service to the school, as well as to the mining interests of the State. . . .

"The Faculty.—Your Committee finds the present faculty to be harmonious and working energetically to maintain a high standard for the school. It is apparent, however, that at some time in past years there has been some friction among faculty members, but we have no recommendations to make regarding that matter, inasmuch as that condition is long past history.

"The Student Body.—The student body is composed of an intelligent and energetic body of young men, who give promise of great usefulness to the State and to the world. They give to the School of Mines and its administration, hearty endorsement and approval. This was evidenced to the Committee during our direct intercourse with them personally and without the presence or interference of any of the faculty members.

"Each of them that were asked about it said that he had come to the School of Mines because of its high reputation, and having been recommended to come, by some prominent man who knew about the school through the direct knowledge of facts.

"The thorough consideration, by your Committee, of the five charges made against the State School of Mines, the Trustees and the President, has elicited the conclusion that the Trustees did not overstep any propriety in assuming jurisdiction occasionally. Their sworn duty to maintain the standing of their charge justified the judgment and action taken.

"It is not to be construed that in any instance did the Trustees assert their authority with the intent to usurp the rights already vested in the President or Faculty. The only one instance introduced occurred prior to 1917 and was authorized by Trustees not now active upon the Board.

"Causes of Dismissal of President Parmelee.—Evidence produced shows that a series of meetings had been held between the Board of Trustees of the School of Mines and Dr. Parmelee, with a view of trying to adjust the pending difficulty caused by a threatened strike of the students, and the Committee found that there was a lack of disposition on the part of both parties referred to, to cooperate and remedy this situation; but in view of the fact that the Board of Trustees are held in full accountability to the Governor and the people of the State for the administration of the school, they therefore must be recognized as the governing power under any and all conditions.

"Notwithstanding the fact that both the Board of Trustees and the President failed to exert every effort to settle the strike controversy, yet it rests within the province of the Board to refuse to reemploy the President or any member of the faculty.

"Dismissal of Teachers Without Adequate Notice or Hearing.—Your Committee finds that instances have occurred where the Board of Trustees have failed to retain the services of faculty members without giving said members sufficient notice of the contemplated action of the Board, and your Committee further finds that such action on the part of the Trustees is discourteous

and tends to the demoralization of the school, and should be discontinued, even though acting within their rights.

"Lowering of Standards of Scholarship by President Alderson.—This charge is a serious one, and is of vital concern to the best interests of the school. However, from the testimony brought before the Committee, it has not been able to determine that such charge is true. It seems that this charge is based wholly on ideas of grading, and the natural difference of opinion of individual teachers and the President may account for this. The testimony produced has not been sufficient to show to the Committee that there has been any material change, other than a few features of additional class work tending to raise the standard.

"Exercise of Improper Pressure by President Alderson to Induce Teachers to Support his Policies or Further his Personal Interests.—The Committee finds no evidence to sustain this charge.

"Plagiarism.—Dr. Alderson is charged with having used articles without the consent of the authors. We find insufficient evidence to justify the charge.

"Bureau of Mines.—The loss of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, to a mining State such as is Colorado, to our minds, is extremely serious and should have been avoided. The evidence shows that the management of the Bureau of Mines felt that they did not have the approval of, or the cooperation of, the Trustees or the President of the School of Mines, and because of this, there was apparently more or less friction. . . .

"It is our opinion that had proper diplomacy been exercised and a keen interest taken by the Board of Trustees and the mining men of the State, the removal of the Bureau of Mines from the State might have been avoided. . . .

"Experimental Mill.—Much has been said in the testimony in the way of criticism against the Experimental Mill at the School of Mines. This seems founded largely on the fact that some twelve or fourteen years ago a considerable sum of money was

provided and a great amount of personal effort was volunteered for the specific purpose of constructing an Experimental Mill at the School of Mines for the use in general research work, in connection with the student body, and the further working of complex ores, such as may be sought out and brought to the School of Mines for a determination of contents, first, of the metallic contents contained therein, second, the process of treatment by which the highest values might be extracted at the minimum cost.

"This criticism goes so far as to say that it was not a well thought-out plan in its very inception, and at no time was it possible to ascertain, through the combination of machinery there installed, results upon which one could rely or depend for an accurate determination of any problem whatever, either in hand or otherwise thought of. Much of the machinery at present installed is obsolete and of no use. The location was most undesirable and, generally speaking, little suited to the purpose for which it was designed. Also, that the railroad facilities were decidedy bad on account of inaccessibility to the main track, thus rendering it impossible to receive ore directly into the mill in car lots. So taken as a whole the mill was of no account and could not be put to any use that would benefit either the School of Mines or mining interests of the State.

"By reason of the very unfavorable criticism made upon the Experimental Mill, as heretofore indicated and as shown in the testimony, your Committee has given this question extended time in the consideration of the features complained of, and after a careful study of the entire condition from the very date of conception of the idea, following through the period of making plans and construction, and finally its use applied by the student body of the School of Mines, your Committee has become convinced that much of said criticism is unjustly made, for the reason that they surely could not have understood the use for which this mill was designed to serve, had it been completed in accordance with plans prepared.

"These plans were started on in the year of 1909, and some time thereafter were completed, and reduced copies were made and submitted to many colleges and persons throughout the world, asking for criticism on said plan, and after hearing from

these sources, the various suggestions were considered and worked into said plans as far as seemed practical until the end, when plans were finished and the construction started in accordance with same.

"The construction of said mill was started in about the year of 1912, and has been in the process of construction in one way or another ever since; it was only partially completed when it was pressed into use, and has never been finished according to the plans prepared, chiefly for the reason that the funds provided were insufficient to complete the job. So it has been used in its unfinished condition ever since.

"Dr. Alderson left the School of Mines in the year of 1913 and returned in the year of 1917, during which interval it has been shown that the experimental mill had been sorely neglected and no effort made looking toward the full completion of the plant, as originally suggested. Since Dr. Alderson's return in 1917 there have been minor improvements and changes made, but nothing to indicate that the proper interest in this was being taken by any one looking toward its completion and rehabilitation, in order to meet the various uses it could be put to in the education of the people and the development of resources of our State. . . .

"*Dr. Alderson.*—It appears to this Committee that the President, Dr. Alderson, is the storm center of criticism of the administration of the School of Mines and that much of the antagonism to him is shown by the older members of the alumni, who feel that because of his administration, the grade of the school and its value to the mining interests of the State has greatly deteriorated. Also, some of the former members of the faculty of the school charge him with methods that are harmful to the discipline of the students, such as changing of grades and interference with faculty members.

"Your Committee finds that Dr. Alderson was President of the School of Mines from 1903 to 1913, at which time he was relieved from that position; that from 1913 to 1917 the school had three presidents, and the evidence shows that during that interval matters at the school went from bad to worse; that to rectify matters the Board of Trustees sought long and faithfully to secure a competent man who would take the position and restore the school to its former standing and usefulness. After weeks

of searching for a competent man it was finally decided to ask Dr. Alderson to come and take the place, which, after much urging, he consented to do. The evidence shows no trace of a conspiracy in this action of the Board.

"Your Committee feels that it is not within its province to seek for evidence as to the character of the administration of Dr. Alderson during his first term as President, or to trace his business career during the years he was not at the School of Mines, unless there have been shown breaches of honorable conduct, which have not been established.

"The record of the school since 1917 has shown a steady growth in attendance, and your Committee has found no evidence of improper conduct in the administration of the affairs of the school since that time.

"There may have been disagreements with some of the faculty as to matters pertaining to the school, and a difference of opinion as to discipline have arisen. To the Committee it seems that these have been magnified in the minds of some of the faculty to such an extent that it is probable that it would be but that if such a condition should occur either the faculty member or the President should be dismissed, but in such a case we believe the Board of Trustees should be the sole arbiters, and this will apply to all charges made along that line.

"It is the opinion of the Committee that the President of the School is responsible to the Trustees as to the matters of discipline, therefore, the President should have the right to participate in the disciplining of the school, and thus maintain proper control.

"The general criticism of President Alderson on his oil shale investigation, and his reports on same through his book and bulletins has been shown by the testimony to have been founded upon his optimistic ideas and representations, through which there was likely to be created an impression tending to serve in directing an innocent investor to be guided in his operations and investments by his confidence in the author, because of his position as President of the School of Mines.

"Your Committee hardly feels competent to definitely judge as to the merits of the said book and bulletins issued on oil shale, but the fact remains, that, throughout research work of any kind or nature, where there is any likelihood or possibility of

creating or establishing an industry of the importance that the oil shale development promises, it is the opinion of the Committee that any person or persons who may enter the field of investigation or research, in all fairness, should justly be given latitude, in support of any optimistic theory, which might be submitted under a condition not yet determined.

"While it appears that President Alderson may have been over-optimistic in his report on this industry, it is shown that while it is yet in its infancy, it promises much for the State in the future, and President Alderson or any other pioneer in this matter should have encouragement and not criticism.

"*Trustees.*—The Board of Trustees is criticized for its action in reinstating the student body that went on strike in 1917. This Committee is not informed as to the merits of that strike, nor the terms of reinstatement, but the evidence shows that at that time the affairs of the school were in a deplorable condition.

"Under these circumstances, the Committee believes that the Board was not only acting within its rights, but it was the duty of said Board to do all in its power to effect a reconciliation of the differences between the faculty and the student body, and to reorganize the school on a working basis.

"Your Committee finds that the management of the School of Mines by the present Board of Trustees is highly efficient, and no well-grounded criticism can be made as to the character, qualifications, or energetic efforts of the members of the Board to promote the best interests of the institution; but your Committee feels that it would be fitting and proper to have a larger representation of the mining industry on the Board.

"Practically all of the criticisms made on the institution result from actions and conduct of officers and members of the Board of Trustees who were in control several years prior to the time the present incumbent assumed office.

"*Recommendations.*—The Committee believes, from the ideas and opinion of mining men that have come to it, that the purpose of the School of Mines is to assist in the development of the mining interests of the State principally, and the oil industry incidentally, and to that end we believe the efficiency of the school may best be advanced by having competent mining men on the Board. There should be, in our judgment, at least three men on

the Board who are vitally interested in general mining and milling.

"Again, the presence of a citizen of Golden seems to be a source of dissatisfaction, and while not questioning in the least the efficiency, integrity, and devotion to the best interests of the school, of the present member from that city, your Committee would suggest that in the reorganization of the Board, if that be decided upon, the members should be selected from elsewhere, in order that no local influence may prevail.

"Your Committee, however, by reason of its investigation, is unanimously of the opinion that this and all of the state schools should be controlled by one governing body that will have the power to coordinate the activities of the various schools, retaining the individuality and identity of each. . . .

"In conclusion, your Committee finds that the management and administration of the School of Mines is efficient, the trustees, officers, and faculty competent, well qualified, and trustworthy, and that the institution, members, officers, faculty, and trustees are entitled to the support, respect, and encouragement of the citizens of this State, the alumni of the institution, and the general public.

"Your Committee is of the opinion that the institution will flourish and its excellent reputation be maintained if it receives the encouragement and patronage to which it is so justly entitled."

It will be noted on careful reading that, while the report in form is complimentary—not to say flattering—to the President and trustees of the School of Mines, the criticisms underlying the report of our sub-committee and the need of radical changes are recognized, affording some basis for the hope that the necessary improvements will be made. That such a "not proven" report should be jubilantly greeted by the section of the Colorado press friendly to the trustees as a complete vindication is sufficient evidence if any were needed of the value of the investigation our committee has made.

COMMITTEE B (METHODS OF APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION)

The chairman having resigned in connection with his transfer to the presidency of Clark University, T. H. Morgan, of Columbia University, has been appointed in his place.

An interesting communication from the Smith College Local Branch (see page 25) has been referred to the Committee.

COMMITTEE D (RELATION OF VOCATIONAL TO GENERAL EDUCATION)

The membership of this committee has been appointed as follows: Chairman, Lucile Eaves (Sociol.), Simmons; E. C. Barker (History), Texas; S. L. Bigelow (Chem.), Michigan; E. F. Buchner (Educ.), Johns Hopkins; A. M. Cathcart (Law), California; G. H. Chase (Archeol.), Harvard; S. S. Colvin (Psychol.), Brown; T. de Laguna (Philos.), Bryn Mawr; E. C. Franklin (Chem.), Stanford; H. S. Fry (Chem.), Cincinnati; W. P. Graham (Engin.), Syracuse; C. H. Grandgent (Rom. Lang.), Harvard; W. M. Hart (English), California; G. O. James (Astron.), Washington (St. Louis); A. H. Lloyd (Philos.), Michigan; W. F. Magie (Physics), Princeton; C. F. Park (Engin.), Mass. Inst. Tech.; W. B. Pillsbury (Psychol.), Michigan; H. C. Sadler (Naval Arch.), Michigan; W. M. Wheeler (Zool.), Harvard; A. C. Whitaker (Econ.), Stanford; F. C. Woodward (Law), Chicago.

COMMITTEE G (METHODS OF INCREASING INTELLECTUAL INTEREST)

The Chairman of this committee has accepted a college presidency and will be succeeded as chairman by E. H. Wilkins of the University of Chicago.

COMMITTEE P (PENSIONS AND INSURANCE)

The new chairman of the Committee has been in correspondence with the officers of the Carnegie Foundation and calls attention to a letter recently issued by Chairman Vanderlip of the trustees

of the Teacher's Insurance and Annuity Association to policy-holders, reading in part as follows:

". . . the most important question before the policy-holders is, therefore,—How can the board of trustees be organized so as to secure in the highest degree safety, the most fruitful financial outcome, efficiency of management, and policies most suitable to the needs of teachers.

"The board of trustees of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association contains sixteen members, four being elected each year. The board must include at least the following groups:

(1) A group of men of the actuarial type, familiar with the principles and theory of insurance and of annuities.

(2) A group of financial men in touch with the economic conditions of the country and able to select sound investments.

(3) A group of business men competent to advise with respect to questions of administration, business procedure, and legal obligation.

(4) A group representing the teachers of the United States and Canada.

"It is to be remembered in addition that in order to secure the service of such trustees, most of them must reside within a convenient distance from the place of meeting. Long experience has shown that trustees, whether of business groups, or of philanthropic institutions, cannot be induced to come regularly to meetings held at a long distance from their homes.

"It is proposed now that group four be chosen by the policy-holders. Let us be entirely clear as to what such trustees can contribute. They cannot take the place either of the actuarial group, or of the financial group, or of the business group. The function of such a group would be to represent on the board of trustees the point of view of the insured, who is in this case the college teacher. More clearly than any other group of men they would bring before the board of trustees the conditions, needs, and desires of the men and of the women for whom the Association exists. It is for this reason that such a group should be included in the governing board of the company. But it ought not for a moment to be assumed that a group thus chosen can do the work of the actuarial, of the financial, or of the business group. Having in view these general considerations, the Association now calls upon its policy-holders for an expression concerning the following matters:

(1) Will an arrangement by which four of the sixteen trustees shall be chosen by the policy-holders meet their wishes as to representation on the board?

(2) Will it be acceptable to the policy-holders if Dr. James R. Angell, President of the Carnegie Corporation, which owns the stock of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, shall designate a group of policy-holders to meet in New York and recommend a practical arrangement whereby the policy-holders may exercise their choice?

(3) Will policy-holders suggest any other arrangement than that

indicated above which may seem to them more feasible and better suited to the purpose?"

The group of policy-holders selected under (2) met in New York on Friday, May 20.

A review of the annual report of the Carnegie Foundation will be found on page 48.

COMMITTEE R (ENCOURAGEMENT OF RESEARCH)

The chairman writes:

"The avowed policy of most American universities is to educate vast numbers a little. The public does not realize what scant time this leaves to an American professor for writing and research. Two letters kindly written at the request of this committee and printed below show that a typical French professor may count on approximately one-third of his time while the university is open, for writing and research. Besides this he has Sundays and his vacations. Any one acquainted with American practice will see that conditions are more difficult here."

(Translated from the French by A. C. L. Brown.)

UNIVERSITY OF RENNES,
RENNES, 5 March, 1920.

FACULTY OF LETTERS.

Dear Sir,—I send you the information that you request. You may, if you think proper, publish it over my name and with my title of Dean and *Correspondant de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.*

Each member of the teaching staff of our universities, whether he be Professor, Assistant Professor, or Instructor, teaches three hours a week. He has therefore to prepare for these three hours of teaching. The subjects of his course change every year, and he must therefore, especially in the Faculty of Letters, devote a good many hours to this preparation. Besides, he must correct the students' themes. They hand in at least one each month to each professor. This task is very unequal, varying according to the number of students in each faculty, although the number of professors ordinarily bears some sort of relation to the number of students. At Rennes, for example, I am the only one who teaches Greek. I have twelve pupils who are preparing for the license and four who are preparing for the *agrégation.* This gives me an average of sixteen themes to correct each month, and is not an excessive task. The correction of themes, although the number of professors is greater, is far heavier at Paris, for example, where the students in my specialty of Greek may be counted by hundreds.

Approximately what time remains to a professor for his writing and research?

First, the vacations: eight days at Christmas, fifteen days at Easter, three months in the long vacation.

Second, while the university is in session. This is a period of thirty-six weeks from which must be deducted six weeks occupied by examinations (at Rennes, thirty-eight hundred candidates take the *examinations du baccalauréat*). We may perhaps assume that three hours of lectures per week, preparation for these lectures, and correction of students' themes absorb altogether three days a week. Four days a week remain, therefore, or a total of about 120 days while the university is in session, for a professor's own work. If he rests Sunday, he has but 90 days.

But I repeat that everything depends upon the number of examinations which one has to prepare and which may intrude upon these 90 days. At Paris, for example, where there are a great many examinations for the *diplôme d'études supérieures* and the *doctorat d'État* (which require many hours of work), the number of hours which a professor has at his disposal may be much reduced.

As for administrative duties, they are not very distracting in France, thanks to our excessive centralization. All questions of a general character are studied and settled by the *Ministère;* all questions relating to the particular university are studied by the Council of the University and by the *Recteur;* questions relating to a particular faculty are referred to the Dean. He does not concern himself with them, however, except in cases where they cannot be settled by the Secretary of the Faculty. Excepting in examination periods when a dean must sign some documents and make a few reports, his administrative duties do not absorb at most more than one hour a day. The administration of a faculty does not therefore seriously interfere with the time which a dean has at his disposal for his own writing and research.

If you desire further information upon particular points I shall be glad to write further.

Cordially yours,

(Signed) G. Dottin.

To A. C. L. Brown.

Société des Amis de L'Université de Strasbourg
Secrétariat: 2, rue Geiler, à Strasbourg

Strasbourg, March 5, 1920.

Prof. A. C. L. Brown,
Northwestern University,
Evanston, Illinois.

Dear Mr. Brown,—Why shouldn't I tell the average time spent, in a week of my pre-war Parisian life, in research and writing? Here is a schedule to which, of course, there was no strict adherence, but which,

in the main, corresponds pretty closely to the use I tried to make of my hours.

Monday.	Writing for myself.
Tuesday.	Writing for myself. 2–6 Bibliography (perusing periodicals for bibliographical record).
Wednesday.	9–12 and 1–5 Bibliothèque nationale.
Thursday.	9–12 Office hours for students. 2–7 and 9–12 Preparation of lectures.
Friday.	8–12 Preparation of lectures. 4.30–5.30 *Public lecture.*
Saturday.	9–10 *Research course for advanced students.* 10.15–11.15 *Explanation of authors for students preparing for the agrégation.*

I do not include (with one exception) the possible night hours, when correcting essays and proofs, preparing for a "doctorat" examination, were the small fry intruding upon one's busy leisure.

What I may state is, that for three years I reckoned five to ten hours of preparation for one hour of public, or "closed," lecture. This, of course, diminishes as experience increases and matter already employed may be brought forward again. As a matter of fact, the administrative part was reduced to nearly nothing; here, on the contrary, where we have much to organize, I feel that (at least this first year) too much time is spent on committees and advisory boards. But it is very interesting to lay the foundations of a new order.

. . . . . .

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) F. BALDENSPERGER.

Formerly Professor of Comparative Literature in the University of Paris, now Professor in the University of Strasbourg.

LOCAL BRANCHES

OFFICERS ELECTED

University of California, Chairman, C. A. Kofoid; Vice-Chairman, F. S. Foote; Secretary-Treasurer, T. Petersson; Additional members of the Executive Committee: W. C. Bray, M. W. Haskell, G. D. Louderback, J. C. Merriam.

Grinnell College (new organization), Chairman, C. N. Smiley; Secretary, H. S. Conrad.

Iowa State University, Chairman, Percy Bordwell.

Knox College, Chairman, A. C. Langden; Secretary, J. L. Conger.

University of Minnesota, Chairman, J. B. Pike.

Northwestern University, Chairman, F. S. Deibler; Secretary, R. G. Martin.

University of Pittsburgh, Chairman, L. E. Gibbs; Secretary, G. E. Jones; Vice-Chairman, J. A. Kock.

Washington University (St. Louis), Chairman, W. E. McCourt; Secretary, C. E. Corey.

CIRCULAR NOTE TO OFFICERS OF LOCAL BRANCHES

The following circular note has recently been sent out to local branches:

I am writing to remind you that the Council has designated for special discussion by Local Branches during the year the following subjects:

COMMITTEE G (METHODS OF INCREASING THE INTELLECTUAL INTEREST AND RAISING THE INTELLECTUAL STANDARDS OF UNDERGRADUATES).—Chairman, Professor E. H. Wilkins, University of Chicago.

COMMITTEE H (DESIRABILITY AND PRACTICABILITY OF INCREASED MIGRATION AND INTERCHANGE OF GRADUATE STUDENTS).—Chairman, Professor A. O. Leuschner, University of California.

COMMITTEE Z (THE ECONOMIC CONDITION OF THE PROFESSION).—Chairman, T. N. Carver, Harvard University.

A preliminary report from Committee G was made at the recent annual meeting. Reference may also be made to the recent article by Professor Showerman (Wisconsin), of Committee G, published in *School and Society*, and quoted in the April BULLETIN.

No report has yet been made by Committee Z (the Economic Condition

of the Profession), but data are sufficiently available for local discussion. It is hoped that such discussion will lead to the transmission of expressions of opinion from local branches to the respective committees and that at least one meeting will be held before the close of the present academic year.

The officers will welcome further expression of opinion from local branches generally on the whole question of relation and means of making the annual meeting as attractive and interesting as possible.

H. W. TYLER, *Secretary.*

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.—At a meeting of the Local Branch held March 10th the following action was taken:

"Voted to recommend reducing the period for 'probation' of nominees from 60 to 30 days; to approve continuing the present system of nomination rather than direct application; to recommend that the Council appoint a committee to revise the method of nomination and election of officers so as to make it more democratic. The idea is to have a kind of 'primary' system by which all may have a voice in choosing officers."

Smith-Towner Bill

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY.—The following committee report has been adopted on proposed Federal legislation:

"FIRST: Is the creation of a Department of Education with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet endorsed? YES.

SECOND: Is the principle of Federal aid to education in the states on condition that the states match the Federal appropriations endorsed? YES.

THIRD: Should a Department of Education supervise the expenditure of Federal appropriations in the states? YES, to an extent sufficient to determine whether or not the funds are used for the purpose for which they are appropriated.

FOURTH: Should a Department of Education be authorized to determine acceptable standards for various types of institutions, to inspect institutions within the state and to publish its findings? The Local Chapter endorsed this item with the following amendment: It is proposed to insert the word 'minimum' after the word 'acceptable' so that the statement will now read: *Should a Department of Education be authorized to determine acceptable* MINIMUM *standards for various types of institutions, to inspect institutions within the states and to publish its findings?* YES.

FIFTH: Is the Smith-Towner bill endorsed without amendment? No.

SIXTH: Is an amendment for the inclusion of the Federal Board for Vocational Education in the Department of Education favored? YES.

SEVENTH: Is an amendment to eliminate the proposed appropriations for cooperation with the states and to provide for an investigation and report by the Department of Education on the distribution of Federal Aid and the amounts needed for specific purposes favored? YES.

EIGHTH: Is an amendment by the Department of Education of an Advisory Council favored? YES.

NINTH: Is the Kenyon bill endorsed? No.

TENTH: Is there any other policy of Federal participation in education suggested? No."

With regard to Item 10, it may be stated that the following resolution was adopted by the Local Branch.

"*Resolved*: That this Branch go on record as in favor of a suggestion that Federal interest in and aid to all branches of education—elementary, secondary, and higher—be extended in future legislation."

A Proposed Appointment Office

SMITH COLLEGE.—"The Smith College Branch of the American Association of University Professors has voted to raise the question as to whether your office might not be made an office to which presidents, deans, and heads of departments might look when seeking men or women for positions on the staffs of their colleges or universities. It was felt that the present means of securing instructors are very casual, and frequently do not lead to the finding of the best man for a given position. There are doubtless many men who are expecting to remain in their present positions, and who are not registered with teachers' agencies, who would nevertheless be willing to consider a change if the right place were offered. And it is precisely these men whom it is difficult for an administration to find. The Branch felt, therefore, that if information concerning the academic record, teaching experience, and original work of members of the American Association of University Professors were on file at some one place, and if this information were made to include some indication as to special lines of work, and perhaps the names of men and women from whom an inquirer might seek further information, a real service would be rendered both to teachers and to officers.

"The Smith College Branch voted that this matter be brought to your attention, with the suggestion that if it lies within the province of any existing committee that committee be asked to consider it, and that if it does not lie within the province of any existing committee the Association appoint a committee for the purpose of considering this matter."*

UNION COLLEGE.—The following communication from the Union College Local Branch has been presented to the Council.

"The Union College Branch of the American Association of University Professors feels that the experience of the last two Annual Meetings of the Association shows that some changes in the plan and conduct of the meetings are advisable if the Association is to have the proper importance in the public mind and the minds of its members.

"At the Cleveland Meeting, of 1919, a great part of the time was taken up by a discussion of the best mode of representation at the Annual Meeting of branches and individual members. A plan for constitutional amendment was proposed and fully discussed, whereby the branches might be represented by delegates. A plan of voting was discussed at length by which the branches and individual members might be represented both in discussion and vote. The plan was subsequently discussed at the branches.

"At the Chicago Meeting, of 1920, there was a considerable attendance, and matters of great importance were largely discussed. But in spite of the very favorable circumstances no votes were taken nor was the opinion of the Association in any way definitely stated or expressed. The general opinion of the meeting seems to have been that much had been said but that no results had been obtained. A great opportunity seems to have been quite lost.

"The Branch believes that some changes in the conduct of meetings would correct what appears a drawback and suggests the following:

"1. Chairmen of committees making reports to the Association should be present at the meetings to lead the discussion of the report. If this be impossible some member of the committee should be delegated to attend.

"2. The meeting should register its judgment on reports of committees as a whole, or on parts of them discussed, by vote of the delegates and members present. Reports of committees to be presented to the Annual Meeting should, if printed before such discussion is had and an expression of opinion on them is made by the Association, be conspicuously marked 'Submitted for consideration only.'

* Referred to Committee B. See page 18.

"3. Reports of committees which require no action by the Association should in general be read at the Annual Meeting by title only and published in the BULLETIN. Such committee reports as that on the status of women members of faculties, migration of graduate students, etc., would not seem to call for discussion or ratification by the Association.

"The Branch would like to repeat some suggestions made by it to the President in the spring of 1919 as to the possibilities of the Annual Meeting. At the foundation of the Association it was thought and hoped that the meetings of the Association might be occasions for some authoritative utterance by the president or another on subjects of general interest in the world of professorial students. Subjects for such addresses could not well be confined to particular spheres of science, but it was thought that in the general field of intellectual life, or in those especial directions wherein more than one field of study was concerned, some general utterances by an acknowledged leader would be of great value. The Branch would like to bring this matter to the attention of the Association, feeling that by some such plan the Annual Meeting might be made of greater value and authority in the learned world, in short, more worth holding and better worth going to."

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY FOR MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE

HISTORY OF THE CASES

On November 7, 1919, Dr. W. H. Lawrence, Jr., a professor of history in Middlebury College, published a brief article entitled "Fewer Strikes and More Production" in a local newspaper (the Middlebury *Register*). A few days later all the members of the Board of Trustees of the College received an anonymous letter which called attention to this article, and charged three members of the faculty (indicated, but not named) with being, variously, pacifists, socialists, or Bolshevists. While most of the 22 members of the Board disregarded this letter,—a few noticing it only to deny any interest or credence in it,—one member, Mr. Charles M. Swift, sent a copy of the anonymous letter to the President of the College, Dr. John M. Thomas, referred to the newspaper article, pointed out that in his interpretation the article was revolutionary in doctrine, and closed his letter with the sentence, "In my opinion, Professor Lawrence ought to change his views or his habitat." Subsequently two other members of the Board also criticised the article adversely in conversation with the President.

On November 12, at a faculty meeting, in order to illustrate a point that had been raised in the course of business, President Thomas read the anonymous letter and made some reference to the criticism of the trustees.

On November 29 there was a joint meeting of the Prudential Committee of the Board of Trustees and the Conference Committee of the Faculty* to discuss matters of policy. During the session the anonymous letter and Professor Lawrence's article were mentioned. In the discussion which followed it was intimated that the President might advise Professor Lawrence to avoid careless expression of opinion. No objection was raised

*On January, 25, 1918, the Board of Trustees of Middlebury College passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved:* That the Faculty be authorized to choose a Committee of Conference of three, with whom the President or any committee of the Trustees may from time to time confer as to changes in the teaching staff of the college, or as to any matter affecting its work or influence; and

to this intimation, and no formal action was taken. Testimony does not agree as to the source of the suggestion.

On December 4, 1919, President Thomas, meeting Professor Lawrence, invited him into his office. (Professor Lawrence had some time before requested an interview on departmental matters.) During this interview President Thomas referred to Professor Lawrence's published articles, advised care in the expression of views on public questions, and read to him Trustee Swift's letter as an indication of how at least one reader had interpreted the article. Professor Lawrence has acknowledged that the President's advice was given in the spirit of "utmost friendliness," but avers that the reading of the sharp criticism emanating from a member of the Board of Trustees, which he might presume to represent the general opinion of the Board, was "well suited to frighten him into good behavior." Professor Lawrence, acknowledging that his newspaper article was so phrased as to be open to misinterpretation, offered at President Thomas' suggestion to write a note expressing more clearly his opinion on the point at issue, the note to be at President Thomas' disposal if occasion for explanations should arise.

This note was written, partly revised along lines suggested by Provost Collins, and on December 26 offered to President Thomas, who accepted it as satisfactory. In the interview of this date Professor Lawrence raised the question of the security of his tenure, and was assured by the President that he desired Professor Lawrence to remain. Professor Lawrence also asked whether President Thomas would be willing to write letters of recommendation for him, if he should decide to apply for a po-

"*Resolved:* That before recommending the dismissal of any member of the permanent teaching staff of the college, conference as to the grounds of such action be had between the Committee representing the Faculty, and the President or a committee of Trustees; and

"*Resolved:* That the Prudential Committee hold stated meetings at Middlebury during term-time with such frequency as the Committee deem necessary or desirable, and that on the occasion of these stated meetings, this committee representing the Faculty be invited to meet the Prudential Committee for conference."

Under the authority of this resolution the faculty had nominated and elected by ballot three representatives to serve as a Conference Committee with the trustees.

sition which he had rejected the year before. (This was a position in a secondary school, at a larger salary than he was receiving.) President Thomas expressed his willingness to do so.

On January 5, 1920, Professor Lawrence, having been offered the position in question, asked President Thomas whether he would assure him—Professor Lawrence—of security of tenure if he declined the new offer. President Thomas answered that it was not in his power to do so. Professor Lawrence states in this connection: "President Thomas emphasized the point that the responsibility for my going was upon me, and that I was not being dismissed. I replied that his own statements and the evident attitude of at least three of the trustees seemed to indicate that my tenure was very uncertain." Professor Lawrence accepted the new position, to which he departed within a few days. His lectures were at once taken over by his colleagues.

Meanwhile the question had arisen whether Professor James G. Stevens, another professor accused in the anonymous letter, should or should not be reappointed. Dr. Stevens had been appointed as Professor of Economics for one year in 1918, his appointment to be continued "if mutually satisfactory." Since, however, President Thomas had been absent during 1918-1919, Professor Stevens was at the end of a year given a reappointment for one year with the same stipulation regarding "mutual satisfaction."

On December 2, 1919, President Thomas notified Professor Stevens that he intended not to recommend him for reappointment, and when asked by Professor Stevens for reasons told him that he regarded him a "misfit in that particular situation." When urged to be specific, President Thomas mentioned dissatisfaction with his pedagogical methods and a tendency to give much attention to subjects not in the sphere of economics.

Professor Stevens requested a hearing before the Prudential Committee of the Trustees and the Conference Committee of the Faculty, a request that was granted him, although Professor Stevens, as a temporary appointee, did not technically have the privilege of such a hearing. On January 17 Professor Stevens presented his case before these committees meeting in joint session. President Thomas stated to the committees that he considered Professor Stevens a misfit at Middlebury College, and intended

not to recommend his reappointment. When Professor Stevens asked that specific charges be brought, the members of the committees seemed to be divided in opinion as to whether, in the case of annual contracts, specific reasons need be given for refusal to reappoint; however, President Thomas briefly repeated the grounds for his decision as expressed in his interview with Professor Stevens of December 2, and Professor Stevens was permitted to reply. The minutes of this meeting are as follows: "The meeting was held at the request of Dr. Stevens. It consisted of a lengthy discussion of his methods of teaching, his attitude and belief on social questions, and his relation to the department of Sociology and Economics."

Three days later, January 20, the teaching staff was, at Professor Stevens' request, called together unofficially by the senior member of the faculty to hear Professor Stevens' presentation of his case. The following resolution was presented by a member of the faculty:

"The members of the teaching staff of Middlebury College believe that no evidence has yet been presented which would warrant the termination of the present temporary contract between Dr. Stevens and the President and Fellows of Middlebury College; and that, therefore, the present agreement should be continued for the next academic year with the understanding that his further reappointment should rest upon his record as a teacher and a man of character, and the present unsupported charges be dismissed unless substantiated."

It was adopted by a *viva voce* vote. A large number of those present voted "aye"; there were no "nays," but some abstained from voting. This vote was reported at a subsequent meeting of the Board of Trustees together with President Thomas' recommendation that Professor Stevens be not reappointed. Professor Stevens was not reappointed.

On February 18, 1920, a letter signed by "A Liberal," entitled "Putting Metternich to Shame," appeared in the *New Republic*. It reads in part:

"*Sir:* In a certain small New England college three men were, until a few weeks ago, teaching those subjects usually designated as the social sciences. Probably all of them would still be engaged in this questionable or nefarious work, endangering the political and economic faith of their

students by the frank presentation of both sides of all disputed questions, had they not been detected, almost providentially it seems, in the following manner. They presumed to employ some of their spare moments in the discharge of their duties as citizens. In part this took the form of writing for a certain 'Bolshevist paper' called the *New Republic*. Now the trustees of this particular college probably do not read the *New Republic*, so these teachers would have escaped, perhaps, if they had not ventured contributions also to journals read by orderly and respectable persons. Seeking to preach the gospel of liberalism where it was most needed, they wrote for the local newspaper of their college town short signed articles on the steel strike and the coal strike, and even on the desirability of finding out something about Bolshevism before pronouncing final judgment upon it. Such headlong radicalism shocked some one, a local alumnus he called himself, into sending to each member of the board of trustees of this New England college an anonymous letter, in which these social science teachers were branded as socialists and Bolsheviki, and one of them accused of actually contributing to the *New Republic!*

"Apparently this tremendous revelation fell as a bolt from the blue upon the trustees. They awoke with a roar, feeling, no doubt, both guilty and outraged. Of course, they agreed that anonymous letters are beneath contempt, yet they felt justified in staying beneath long enough to utilize this one. Presently some of them bombarded the president of this college with wrathful protests, the general drift of which seems to have been that teachers holding such views must change their views or their habitat. And these gentle remonstrances soon bore fruit. One of these dangerous radicals was peremptorily fired; or, to phrase it in the academic jargon, he was notified that he had not given satisfaction and would not be reappointed at the end of the year. Another received assurance that his tenure was highly uncertain and, indeed, depended upon the successful placation of righteously indignant trustees; and that, if he were allowed to remain at all, he would be under suspicion. Whereupon he promptly resigned. As for the third offender, he was about to take a sabbatical year, so his case was left for future settlement. Meanwhile the teaching staff of the institution took a hand by adopting a spirited resolution against the dismissal of the victim above-mentioned and in favor of his reappointment without prejudice from his recent malefactions. To this the trustees gave no heed."

This letter was soon recognized as referring to Middlebury College, and awakened widespread discussion in college circles. Professor Lawrence acknowledged authorship of the letter. Inquiries from various quarters suggesting an investigation came to officers of the American Association of University Professors. It should be added, however, that Professors Lawrence and Stevens did not formally request an investigation, though they

signified their approval and their readiness to lay all their evidence before a committee should one be appointed. They submitted their statements during March, April, and May. On May 4, 1920, President Thomas in reply to a letter of inquiry addressed to him by the Acting Chairman of Committee A, Professor A. O. Lovejoy, made a preliminary statement about the cases in controversy, adding, "If there is the slightest suspicion that Middlebury College has not acted honorably and fairly toward these professors, or has interfered with reasonable academic liberty, I beg that you do not drop the inquiry until the facts have been fully ascertained and a judgment rendered."

On the basis of the statements submitted by the several interested parties, Committee A of the Association decided that an investigation should be made, and in October, 1920, requested the undersigned sub-committee to proceed with the inquiry. The chairman of the sub-committee sent letters of inquiry touching the points at issue to President Thomas, Professors Lawrence and Stevens, and to all the full Professors of Middlebury College. After replies had come in from all but two of those addressed, Professor James W. Goldthwait, a member of the committee, conducted a personal inquiry (December 17–18) at Middlebury, interviewing President Thomas and ten of the professors of the college.

The committee feels under obligation to thank all of those who have been plied with letters and questions for their generous response, cordial cooperation, and very apparent desire to give fair and unbiased testimony.

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

I. In the case of Professor Lawrence the Committee has not been able to discover that the authorities of Middlebury College acted in such a way as to imperil academic freedom. The specific acts that have been adduced to prove the culpability of the authorities are:

(1) The reading of the anonymous letter at the faculty meeting on November 12, 1919.

In view of the question under discussion at the meeting, it seems to the Committee that the reading of the letter was pertinent.

(2) The personal advice given Professor Lawrence in the interview of December 4.

Such advice could not reasonably be taken amiss in view of Professor Lawrence's admission that his article was so phrased as to be open to misunderstanding. However, a distinction should be made between the use which President Thomas made of Trustee Swift's letter and the clear implications of the letter itself. From this letter it is evident that, so far as Trustee Swift was concerned, the holding of views expressed by Professor Lawrence in the Middlebury *Register* article was sufficient grounds for dismissal. Had this opinion prevailed among the trustees and had Professor Lawrence been dismissed on this account, it would, in the opinion of the Committee, have constituted an unwarranted interference with academic freedom. And the Committee grants that a hasty conclusion based upon the nature of Trustee Swift's letter might lead to the fear that dangerous pressure was being, or might soon be, applied in restraint of legitimate freedom; for, while the expression of a single member of the Board of Trustees cannot be considered official action, it is hardly to be expected that instructors will be in a position to know whether the trustee in question is or is not an influential or dominant member of the Board. A member of the governing board who suggests that an instructor "change his views or his habitat" would naturally seem to be writing not as a mere individual, but as a person endowed with some power in determining whether or not the instructor should be reappointed. However, it seems clear to the Committee, after considering all the reports attainable, that the President showed the letter to Professor Lawrence frankly as the best proof then available of what meaning an outsider might naturally find in the article under discussion rather than with the view of bringing administrative pressure upon him. In judging the probable weight of such a letter, it must be borne in mind that the Board of Trustees by their resolution of 1918 had provided a committee which would have given Professor Lawrence at the proper moment an opportunity to state his case and to answer hasty and *ex parte* criticism. It would seem, therefore, that had Professor Lawrence made a reasonable analysis of the situation, he could not have

concluded that Trustee Swift's letter or the presentation of it to him by President Thomas need certainly be considered as a threat.

(3) The refusal of President Thomas on January 5 to guarantee Professor Lawrence permanency of tenure if he should decide to remain.

It seems to the Committee that the request for such a guarantee from the President was ill-considered. The recent tendency in college administration at Middlebury and elsewhere has fortunately been to lessen the arbitrary power of the President. However, it is only fair to point out that an unhealthy fear of insecure tenure which made itself felt in this case, was in some measure justified by the obscurities in the resolutions of 1918. Those resolutions do not clearly enough define the term "permanent teaching staff," nor what rank of office or term of service will secure "permanency," nor do they give judicial powers to, or require a formal decision from, the joint committee which they constitute. When the machinery of conference is so inadequately understood that officious individuals on the Board of Trustees can disregard it to the point of interfering in academic matters, it is not to be expected that instructors shall in every instance give it full reliance.

II. Though Professor Stevens, in view of his short-term appointment, does not hold that he has a case in court, the Committee has carried its inquiry into this case also, in view of the widely published charge that Professor Stevens was dismissed because he was a "dangerous radical." What weight was actually given in the President's initial decision to the consideration of "radicalism" it is not possible to determine; but the Committee finds that a reasonable case has been established for the refusal to reappoint on the grounds offered by the President, in view of the fact that Professor Stevens was admittedly being tested on a temporary appointment for the position as head of an important department.

While the Committee does not question the advisability of colleges making such temporary appointments, it recognizes the danger to academic freedom if the term "mutual satisfaction" is to be interpreted on the side of the college authorities by the President alone. In such circumstances important tendencies that happen to be distasteful to the President and his personally

chosen advisers may be weeded out in the lower ranks, while the faculty committee, which acts only in cases of permanent officers, is protecting the liberty of those who have survived an initial presidential scrutiny. Not the least danger to academic freedom lies in pressure exerted upon the president of an institution by individual members of its faculty, a danger to which the attention of the Committee has been called while investigating the preliminaries of these cases. The employment of a responsible faculty committee on appointments and dismissals would do much toward excluding hasty animadversions by irresponsible colleagues and providing an open and thorough examination of the instructor's essential qualifications before serious action is taken.

In the case of Professor Stevens, President Thomas, after gathering opinions informally from various faculty members, announced his adverse decision to Professor Stevens. But when requested, he granted Professor Stevens a hearing before the joint committee, a privilege not accorded temporary appointees by the resolutions of the trustees. If such an open discussion before a responsible committee had been granted before a decision had been announced, misunderstandings as to motives would doubtless have been avoided. It is questionable, however, whether a joint committee of faculty members and trustees is the proper group to which to refer the purely academic questions that usually arise in the inquiry regarding an instuctor's pedagogical methods and field of instruction. By the resolutions of the trustees referred to above, Middlebury College already has a faculty committee (the Conference Committee) of three representatives, nominated and elected by ballot, which might logically be called upon to serve as the President's advisers in such minor cases.

In view of these findings the Committee feels that it should also take cognizance of Professor Lawrence's widely read attack upon the college published in the *New Republic*. The letter, to be sure, was impersonal, both in subject and in signature, but it could hardly have been supposed that anonymity would conceal the identity of the subject. Such minor errors in procedure as have been committed by the college authorities—chiefly because the reforms already undertaken were still in an experimental

stage—might better have been indicated to the authorities in private communications. The Committee feels that the published letter, exaggerated in its description of conditions, and misleading in its implications, was gravely unjust to the authorities of Middlebury College.

Respectfully submitted:

M. J. Elrod,
(University of Montana)

James Goldthwait,
(Dartmouth College)

George G. Groat,
(University of Vermont)

Jesse S. Reeves,
(University of Michigan)

Tenney Frank, *Chairman*,
(Johns Hopkins University)

On behalf of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure I have examined the report of the Committee on Inquiry on Middlebury College and find it to be in accordance with the procedure approved by the General Committee; and as Acting Chairman of the Committee I authorize its publication. The Committee of Inquiry alone is responsible for its findings of facts.

F. S. Deibler,
Chairman, Committee A.

RECENT EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

EXTRACTS FROM THE ANNUAL REPORT OF PRESIDENT HADLEY OF YALE.—*The Problem of a Common Freshman Year for Academic and Scientific Students.*—"The problem of shaping the courses of study in the Freshman year was a difficult one, because we had to satisfy several conflicting demands. The faculties of the College and the Scientific School which were to receive students at the end of their Freshman year, wanted the boys prepared for advanced work in the subjects in which they were specially interested. The members of the Engineering Department wanted them trained in mechanics; the Chemical Department wanted them trained in chemistry; and so on all along the line. On the other hand, the graduates wanted the Freshman year to be as far as possible a general course common to all students. They said, and said with force, that the thing which made it most worth while for an engineer to take his training at Yale was the fact that he had a background of something besides engineering; and the thing that made it important to have a joint Freshman Year at all was the fact that different kinds of men who came to college required a common groundwork of education. But when we came to speak of the common groundwork of education we faced another difficulty, for students from different schools had presented different studies. Instruction that was much needed by one boy was almost superfluous for another. To meet all these conflicting demands in a way to satisfy everybody was impossible. That Dean Angier has so far met them as to give substantial satisfaction to the representatives of different views is an achievement of which he may well be proud.

"The subjects prescribed for all Freshmen are English and European History. In addition to these general requirements, each student will elect three of the following subjects: Mathematics; Natural Science (Chemistry or Physics); Modern Language (French, German, or Spanish); Ancient Language (Latin or Greek); Introduction to Engineering and Mechanical Drawing. In Dean Angier's first report, which will appear one year hence, we may expect a fuller account of the workings of this curriculum

and the reasons for the choice of subjects than it is practicable to give at the present day. . . .

Faculty Salaries.—"It has been easy to keep our students; it has been harder to keep our professors. The high cost of living has made the old scale of salaries inadequate. The discovery which the country made during the war time that professors were extremely useful for other purposes besides college teaching has increased the intensity of outside competition for their services. Under these circumstances a readjustment of salaries was inevitable. It was initiated in February, 1919; it will go into full effect in September, 1920. It represents an average increase of fifty per cent. It is not a flat increase. The difference between the highest and lowest salaries paid to officers of the same rank is greater than it previously was, and greater than it still is at most other colleges. Under the old system increases of salary were primarily based on seniority and only secondarily upon service. To-day they are primarily based upon service, and only secondarily upon seniority. The change involves the making of some rather difficult distinctions; but it is, I believe, in its essence a salutary one.

"The normal scale of salaries actually adopted for full-time members of the teaching staff is as follows: Instructors, first year $1,500, second year $1,800, third year $2,100, fourth year and thereafter $2,500; Instructors rendering exceptional service, $3,000; Assistant Professors, first appointment (normally for three years) $3,000, second $3,500, third $4,000; Assistant Professors rendering exceptional service and Associate Professors, $4,500 or $5,000; Professors $5,000, $6,000, $7,000 or $8,000. The maximum will be increased to $10,000 in the immediate future.

"It will be noted that these are salaries intended for men who are doing full-time work. Instructors and assistant professors who are employed for part time will be paid on the basis of service rendered. In the case of men connected with the faculty of Yale University whose distinction entitles them to be included in the lists of our professors we distinguish three classes: full-time professors, with the range of salary already named; part-time professors, who wish to supplement their income as teachers by outside professional work, who will normally receive salaries of from $3,000 to $6,000, according to the character of the ser-

vice rendered; and associates with professorial rank, whose main work lies elsewhere and whose teaching in connection with the University is an incident in their professional career, who will receive salaries of from $1,000 to $3,000.

"The establishment of the new grade of Associate Professor has been authorized and certain appointments to this grade have already been made. The present salaries will be the same as those of assistant professors rendering exceptional service: $4,500 and $5,000—the difference of title conveying simply a greater expectation of permanence. In the course of the next year it will be possible to define more clearly than we have yet done the distinction between the assistant professorship and the associate professorship; but it is not likely that we shall make this distinction so sharp a one as some other universities have tried to do.

"One feature in the salary system adopted at Yale deserves special notice, because it is different from that which prevails at most other institutions. The highest salary of an Instructor is as great as the lowest normal salary of an Assistant Professor; the highest salary of an Assistant Professor is as great as the lowest normal salary of a Professor. We believe that advancement in salary and advancement in title should be based on two distinct grounds—salary being primarily a compensation for service rendered, and title a recognition of distinction as a teacher, scholar, or administrator. In the majority of cases the two will go together. The fact that a man is more distinguished generally enables him to render greater service to the University, even though that distinction be often intangible and hard to measure. But it sometimes happens that the man of less distinction, or at any rate less promise of distinction, renders the greater service; and a university which cannot increase the salary without change of title is either compelled to let an extremely useful man go because it cannot afford to pay him what it ought to, or to promote him to a position which he has not as yet fully earned. The scale now adopted will reduce these dangers to a minimum."

"It is a common belief that a university is distinguished from a school by the fact that it teaches more kinds of things. But the real difference lies not in the variety of subjects taught; it

lies in the breadth of vision with which they are taught and the breadth of recognition achieved by the teachers. The outlook of the school is local; the outlook of the university is world-wide. The teaching of the school may be sectarian; the teaching of the university is catholic. The school may draw its adherents from certain classes or groups; the university appeals to the whole world. Under Dr. Angell's leadership Yale will enjoy this vision and this outlook, will teach in this spirit, and will sound this appeal."—*President Hadley at the Yale Dinner in New York.*

NOTES ON TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES.—The meeting was held at Columbia University, November 18 and 19.

The Committee on Academic and Professional Higher Degrees presented an extended report including the following recommendations:

"That the designation 'Doctor' be interpreted to have a twofold meaning, namely, (*a*) the meaning which it has always had in the degree of Doctor of Philosophy as a research degree signifying sound scholarship and power for research; (*b*) the meaning which it has in medicine as a highest practitioner's or professional degree signifying higher professional training in graduate standing equivalent in standard to the Ph.D. degree; and that this twofold meaning of the designation 'Doctor' be adopted as a permanent policy with the understanding that the professional Doctor's degrees to be recognized for the present shall be the following: M.D., J.D., Dr.P.H., and Ed.D. . . .

" . . . The Committee is of the opinion that the subject-matter of the applied sciences or the professions constitutes appropriate fields for research leading to the degree of Ph.D. The Sc.D., without specification of field, shall be construed as an honorary degree.

" . . . Professional study beyond that corresponding to a master's degree may lead to professional Doctor's degrees, provided that such Doctor's degrees be maintained on a standard equivalent to the Ph.D. degree, higher professional training taking the place of power for research required for the Ph.D. A type of such a degree is found in the medical profession, viz., M.D.,

as conferred by leading medical schools. Other satisfactory types in process of development are the J.D., Dr.P.H., and Ed.D."

Cooperation and Research in the Humanities

"On the international side, America has both an obligation and an opportunity. Scholarship, we are fond of saying, is international, yet the different nations have contributed to it in very unequal degree, and the American contribution is still relatively small. We are carrying on research creditably in many fields, but we still rely almost exclusively upon European editions and collections, European journals and bibliographies, to which few or no American scholars contribute. We are still largely passengers carried along by the labors of others. With the war, our responsibility has increased. Many of the great undertakings of European scholarship, national and international, have dragged or ceased for want of funds. We need to contribute to their maintenance. Others languish for lack of laborers; we, scarcely touched by the losses of war, must supply more of the laborers. We have many excellently trained scholars. We must train more, and carry more of the burden of the world's scholarship. Europe is ready to welcome, not only our money, but our men, particularly to the great fields which concern no one nation alone. . . .

"It will thus be seen that the International Union of Academies is the complement, for the humanities, of the International Research Council, and that the American Council of Learned Societies is analogous to the National Research Council. The problems of the humanities and the natural sciences are not the same, but they are in many respects parallel and seem to call for some parallelism in organization. Nor are the fields entirely separate. Geography has its human as well as its physical aspects; experimental psychology runs into social psychology, and this into sociology and political science; science itself has its history, and the scientific method is limited to no one group of subjects. The line between the natural and the social sciences can no longer be sharply drawn. There are problems of cooperation between the sciences and the humanities as well as among the members of the separate groups . . . " (*Dean Haskins, Harvard*).

Research Professorships

These were the subject of a general discussion including the following significant paragraph:

"I am extremely interested in seeing our teaching institutions acquire endowments for the encouragement of discovery. I am apprehensive lest the great scientific foundations of this country draw away from our universities our very best men. If this takes place, then instruction will suffer and all learning will suffer. It seems to me that the history of advancement shows that where there has been a master there have been disciples. I am inclined to think that the disciple is essential to the master. Our best work now being done in California is by men who have closely associated with them a group of students" (*President Barrows*).

Cooperation Between Universities and Industries

was discussed by Professor Johnston (Yale) and Dr. F. B. Jewett (chief engineer of the Western Electric Company):

" . . . I am not suggesting, of course, that mere material progress is all progress, I am not suggesting that either prosperity in trade or the cheapening of manufactures is going to be the great regenerator of mankind; I accept the view that man does not live by bread alone; but if you wish to improve the material lot of man (and surely that is worth while) it cannot be by quarrelling over the manner in which profits shall be distributed, or any of the controversies which divide various interests and various countries. It cannot be by those things, although those are subjects that we cannot avoid; but the thing that is really going to make a difference in the future, which is going to make the remainder of the twentieth century different from the nineteenth century, and the twenty-first century different from the twentieth, is the command for industrial purposes which man has over the forces of nature. That can only be, in the first place, by the cultivation of pure science, of science for itself and only for its own sake. It can only be if we contrive to breed and educate men who, without any thought of self-advancement, are consumed by a curiosity to know, and that stage having been passed, that end having been attained, then to learn to apply the knowl-

edge which they have disinterestedly acquired to the great purposes of industrial development. That, speaking broadly, looking at the material progress of mankind as far as we can venture upon any prophecy, that, and that almost alone, is going to be the main engine of human advance. . . .

"But I need not go into the advantages of cooperation between university and industry, for it is agreed that industry requires a supply of men which only the university can furnish and that the university needs and deserves the support for its advanced teaching which the industry can and should give. The question is rather: How far is it safe for the university to go in this direction? To this my answer would be that the university should go just as far as is compatible with its real function—that of training men and that each step should be judged with reference to whether it does or does not contribute toward this training, directly or indirectly. It is not easy to say in advance whether on this basis a given proposal will prove to be desirable, and opinion upon such point would be diverse. The criterion is whether the work proposed constitutes a problem to teacher or student, or is merely in the nature of routine; if the former, it would be acceptable, if the latter, it should be discouraged. . . .

"Nor need the teacher be precluded from carrying on—himself or with his students—investigations of interest to the industry, provided that these are investigations of real fundamental problems yielding results worthy of publication. Indeed there is no real distinction between this type of research and research in 'pure' science, for if it is a real problem it is sure to involve fundamental and interesting things; which, it may be remarked, many of the 'pure' problems studied do not, being undertaken rather so that the man may have some justification for writing a paper than with a purpose of advancing knowledge."

Fellowships, with Special Consideration of their Relation to Teaching

"The profession of teaching, then, has been a more or less coddled profession, more or less artificially recruited and maintained. Naturally the coddling has been different in measure and in methods at the different grades from kindergarten to university. The primary and secondary schools have owed much to the de-

layed age of marriage of women as well as to the need of men to earn money in their periods of preparation for their chosen careers. Colleges and universities have been beneficiaries of fellowships. But, whatever the methods or forms of the artificial support, the fact of it is evident. Some relation, too, perhaps even of cause and effect,—only I should have difficulty in deciding which has been the cause,—must have existed between the coddling and the not uncommon sentimentality about teaching. So often teaching has been regarded as a virtue of the sort said to bring its own reward, if not here, then in another world, and so possibly it has been paid only at a minimum in the return of this world, for sentimentality may often gloss underpay. Sentimentality may gloss inefficiency also, letting good-will stand for good performance. So again, teaching has been in various ways a coddled profession. Commonly it has been a good berth, but often at the same time a makeshift, a last resort, or—however poorly carried out—a 'noble service'; but it has not been an altogether substantial and substantially productive profession, or to say the least that can be said, for real service in the future it must be different from what it has been" (*Dean A. H. Lloyd, University of Michigan*).

THE DILEMMA OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCE.—"I believe that the prevailing lack of interest among students in the intellectual work of the college is largely due to the uncertainty regarding the fundamental purposes of college studies. The college, as the student sees it, aims at nothing that can be described except in the haziest and most uninspiring generalities. It has no direct contacts with definite and tangible human undertakings. Complete success in mastering its intellectual offerings admittedly has very little effect upon one's later career, unless this career should happen to be teaching.

"Contrast this situation with the situation of the vocational colleges. There is nothing vague about the objectives of colleges of engineering, law, education, or commerce. The officers of such institutions know exactly what they are training students for. The students have the aim clear in view and strive to attain it with a persistency and an enthusiasm that are rarely found among graduates in colleges of liberal arts. It may be claimed that this

difference is unavoidable. The experience of other countries with higher liberal training, however, indicates that our difficulties are not necessarily inherent in the enterprise itself.

"At present the vocational colleges are making tremendous inroads on the territory of the college of liberal arts. They have stolen a large part of its ancient teaching material. They are acquiring each year a larger share of its former clientage. Of course there are pressing economic reasons for the shift of a large portion of the college population to vocational curricula, but quite as potent a motive is the appeal made by the greater vitality of higher vocational courses. Students are not congenitally afraid of work. They are afraid of being bored and they want to know in definite terms what it is that they are working for. . . .

"What should be the content of liberal arts curricula? This is undoubtedly the most difficult problem of all. It is the subject about which there is the greatest diversity of opinion and concerning which the most dogmatic pronouncements have been made. Indeed it involves finally the whole matter of the objectives of college education. I do not know the answer to the question. But I believe there are ways in which a fairly satisfactory answer may be found for each institution. Instead of determining the content of curricula by *a priori* reasoning, the contrary procedure should be followed. An analysis should be made of what college graduates are expected to be and to do. These common obligations and experiences shared by all, no matter what their occupations, should determine the fixed requirements of liberal arts curricula. Every man and woman has certain fundamental duties as a citizen. The responsibilities of citizenship have changed and broadened with the establishment of new international relations. Alterations in the economic balance of the world demand of the future citizen knowledge of certain subjects that was not needed a few years ago. It seems clear that, without very exhaustive analysis, colleges may determine that the core of a modern liberal education must be the social sciences. How much further it will be necessary to go in the direction of definite prescription can only be determined on the basis of

such a recanvass of the demands of the modern man's world as has just been mentioned. But this recanvass must be made without preconceptions. Its controlling motives must be the facts of a situation external to the college and not inherited academic superstitions."—*Dr. Samuel P. Capen, Educational Review, April, 1921.*

WASHBURN COLLEGE.—It is interesting and important to learn from the report of the American Association of University Professors on conditions in Washburn College, that Professor J. E. Kirkpatrick, who was summarily dismissed from Washburn College two years ago, was innocent of any act which could warrant the action taken by the trustees of the institution. It is also very significant to learn that one of the chief reasons for his dismissal was his effort to liberalize a peculiarly reactionary and stupid administration. But the most significant thing about the report is the fact that this committee of the Association has discovered that there is something more fundamentally wrong in our colleges and universities than the lack of academic freedom and irregular procedure in the dismissal of professors. It has discovered that an irresponsible system administered by an autocratic executive demands attention. Of course it was inevitable that the Professors' Association should come into conflict with the system and question the theory upon which it is based. Surely, now that the situation has so clearly come to light, the community will find a way to amend it. We do not believe that an American college community will remain helpless before an administration which has been so conclusively proved to be incompetent, autocratic, unreliable, treacherous, and dishonest.—*The Review.*

The report includes the usual information in regard to allowances granted during the year and those now in force. The total amount paid in 1919–20 to persons connected with associated institutions reached $761,000, to persons connected with non-associated institutions, $114,000,—a slight increase over the preceding year but considerably less than five years ago. The annual load at the end of the fiscal year was $870,000. Total amounts paid to larger institutions are: Harvard, $625,000; Yale, $548,000; Columbia, $464,000; Cornell, $364,000.

The question of Federal income tax on allowances has been settled on the basis that the pensions are gifts, or gratuities not awarded for services which have been rendered.

The total estimated present value of liabilities under the old rules is approximately $26,000,000. The number of persons in receipt of allowances April 1, 1920, was fifty-seven, the number connected with associated institutions having expectations of allowances under the present rules, 4,552,—a decrease of 947 since December, 1917. The accumulation in Reserve Fund No. 1 has exceeded expectation on account of high interest rates, and it is estimated that resources available will equal these liabilities. An examination of present salaries shows, however, a large increase over those paid in 1917. Some years must necessarily elapse before the actuaries can estimate the total load to be expected except upon the basis of general approximation.

The progress of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association is reviewed at length. The Association began issuing contracts in March, 1919; by July, 1920, it had written 500 life insurance policies, aggregating $2,500,000, and 486 annuities contracts representing the payment at maturity of $456,000. These were written in 180 institutions. June 30, 1920, 41 institutions had accepted the plan of the Association. The terms of acceptance for 29 were printed in the Fourteenth Report and those of the additional 12 are included in the present one.

Of the 500 life insurance policies, 249, aggregating slightly less than $1,000,000, are term policies. The average amount of all policies is $6,740. It is said that the business of insurance has so long depended on solicitation by agents that college teachers as well as all other groups in the body politic are accustomed to

defer taking on insurance responsibility until sufficiently urged by the agent. That the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association should have written so many policies in the first year of its existence is considered "most encouraging." "The Association does not compete with the great insurance companies, nor will it endeavor to offer those benefits which do not belong to the legitimate insurance and that minister chiefly to the demands of competitive business."

At the end of December, 1920, the Association had written 653 insurance policies, covering $3,356,747 of insurance, and 554 annuity contracts providing $624,398 annual income at retirement. The payment of future increases in overhead expenses has been assumed by the Carnegie Foundation. "The Association is organized solely to be of service to college teachers, and was incorporated under state laws as an insurance company entirely in the teachers' interest and mainly to secure two objects:

"1. That the teacher should have an enforceable contract for his insurance and for his old age annuity; and

"2. That he should have the protection that comes from the scrutiny of a well-conducted State Department of Insurance. No protection to the policy holder approaches that which arises from such an independent outside scrutiny as that exercised by an efficient department of insurance."

The new retiring allowance system of Harvard University is discussed at length. "The method of dealing with the retiring allowance question by the Harvard Governing Corporation and the mingling of faculty and trustee action which determined the final form of the old-age retiring scheme reflects in a striking way the confusion which has fallen upon many American institutions of learning as to the distinction between government and administration. At the present moment there is a passion for what we like to call democratic methods of administration. One of the fallacies most characteristic of such periods is the assumption that democracy consists in diluting the responsibility of government among the whole body of those affected by it. True democracy and real freedom lie in another direction. . . .

"On the other hand, it was in every way to be desired that the governing body learn the wishes and opinions of the members of the teaching and administrative staff with regard to the terms

and conditions which they might consider desirable in the establishment of any such system. It is in the answer to this third question that the report of the Harvard faculty has significance and value. It would have been still more valuable—I hesitate to say more democratic—had it reflected not only the wishes of the faculty, but also of the whole instructing and administrative staff, and particularly of those whose interests were directly affected."

The report of the Harvard committee is quoted, the final paragraph reading as follows:

"In favor of independence in the control of teachers' annuities a final consideration may be suggested. An Association which is endowed with capital stock by the Carnegie Corporation, and whose relations with the Carnegie Foundation are so intimate, must necessarily stand allied, in the public mind, with these two older organizations. Whatever attitude popular opinion may assume toward the latter will reflect itself upon the former. Now it is not desirable that college teachers as a class should be thought, even by indirection, to be susceptible to the influence of great accumulations of wealth. Nor is it desirable that they should be invested by the public imagination with an automatic allegiance to the educational views—however admirable these may be—of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Other things being equal or nearly equal, is it not better that college teachers incur no obligations or responsibilities, direct or indirect, big or little, real or apparent, to any but themselves and the institutions which they serve? Bound together by an undivided loyalty to their college, they can best develop that corporate spirit which counts for so much in the happiness and the efficiency of labor."

On this report the president of the Foundation proceeds to comment magnanimously as follows:

"The Carnegie Foundation has had the good fortune to be favored with many criticisms by college groups upon the plan of old age annuities proposed by the Teachers Insurance Association. None of these reports have brought greater satisfaction to the Foundation than that of the Harvard Faculty Committee. It is in excellent English and in admirable temper—qualities by no means characteristic of all the academic outpourings in these matters. Throughout the report the effort to be courteous and fair is evident at every paragraph, and one likes to believe that courtesy and fairness are qualities characteristic of the true scholar."

Some fundamental questions raised by the Harvard faculty report are the following:

"Can the old age retirement problem be solved for college teachers by simply raising their salaries to a higher level, leaving the individual teacher to provide his annuity?

"Is the assumption that 'the cost of a pension comes in any case out of the teacher's earnings' and 'it is immaterial, in the long run, whether nominally the college pays it all or the teacher pays it all or each pays half' justified by experience?

"Are there advantages to teachers and to colleges in having each college accumulate and operate its own savings fund as the basis of an old age annuity plan?

"What form of disability insurance is desirable and feasible for college teachers? and to what extent does it offer a support in case of disability?"

". . . It is somewhat remarkable that the reports made on these subjects have rarely considered them from the point of view of the body of younger men—the class having most at stake in their solution. . . .

"That college salaries should be raised, no one will question. Before the World War they were far too low. . . . But no matter what level salaries reach—even though a period of declining prices should leave the college professor with his present salary in a very advantageous position—no raise of the level of salary will bring about a general movement on the part of teachers to set aside a part of their income for old age protection. This is the universal testimony of experience, and the reasons lie in the qualities of human nature. No matter what the level of salary, the time will never come when provision for one's old age or for one's dependents can be made without a measure of self-control and self-denial. Only a limited number of men possess these qualities. In this respect teachers are not different from other human beings. A recent enquiry, which is analyzed in the Ninth Bulletin of the Foundation, indicates that nearly twenty per cent of college teachers do not even carry insurance, while the amount usually carried by instructors is $2,000, by junior professors $3,000, and by full professors $5,000. . . .

"The contractual plan of old age annuities for teachers is being conducted upon two methods. In the first the college governing body pays the entire premium. This plan has been adopted by two American universities using the contracts of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association. In the second plan the college and the teacher cooperate, usually on equal terms. This plan is in use in the Federated British Universities and in more than forty American institutions. Harvard has

adopted a third plan based on the accumulation of annual (or monthly) premiums but paid entirely by the teacher.

"It is perfectly clear that if the college fixes for the moment a level of salary and then offers to its teachers an annual payment on old age annuities, the proceeds of which must go to them or to their dependents, the effect will be to raise temporarily the level of compensation. The notion that it is of no consequence to the teacher whether this level is reached by a direct payment to the teacher or by the addition of an annual payment toward the old age annuity, rests upon the unjustified assumption that the sum set aside by the college for the annuity payment would have been added in any case to salary. Exactly the opposite reasoning has been followed by the college authorities. They have raised salaries without regard to whether an old age pension was guaranteed to the teacher. They have then added an annuity payment to the salary for two distinct reasons: first, their feeling of responsibility for such a system of retirement from the standpoint both of the college and of the teacher; and secondly, because they were fully aware that only in a limited number of cases would a sum added to salary be devoted to the purpose of old age protection. . . .

"The argument that the payment on the old age annuity is taken out of the 'wages' of teachers loses sight of the process, thus briefly described, under which salaries are determined by university and college boards of government. . . . The process by which the 'wages' of the teacher are determined, in an open market such as exists in our North American institutions, is by no means a simple one, but it is very much that which has just been described. The action taken by the various colleges that undertake to pay in whole or in part the annual premiums on annuity contracts belonging to their teachers, represents an increase in the existing scale of compensation of the teacher. . . .

"No old age pension system has proved permanently satisfactory that depended upon the single contribution of either the employer or the employed. . . .

"The disadvantages of the particular plan adopted at Harvard are obvious. . . . The participant . . . has no contract; he can have no assurance as to what the amount of accumulations will be thirty-five years hence. . . .

"The Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association offers precisely what Harvard cannot offer—a contract. . . .

"Entirely apart from all other features of the Harvard savings plan, the action of the Harvard Corporation in placing the old age retirement once more on an indefinite rather than on a contractual basis is to be regretted. . . . A savings fund set up

under competent men, such as manage the finances of Harvard, will no doubt be most carefully managed. The plan proposed in the Savings Fund is simple and financially sound, but its terms place the participants in the plan under a serious disadvantage. The law would not permit an insurance company to make such an arrangement with its policy-holders. . . . "

Migration becomes far less easy when the college manages its own savings fund.

"The separate reserve by a college is simply a savings fund into which the participants make deposits under stated conditions. Experience has shown that a large proportion of the contributors to a savings fund will in time demand the return of their accumulations on terms which the custodians of the fund will find it practically impossible to refuse. . . .

"The English companies with which the Federated Universities contracted have an overhead of from six to ten per cent. Commercial companies in the United States have an overhead cost of from eighteen to thirty per cent. The Teachers Insurance Association has no overhead cost."

Disability Insurance.—"The agitation for disability insurance rests partly upon the same basis" (the competitive struggle for insurance business). "The sudden demand on the part of teachers for such insurance is not so much a reflection of their own conclusions, as of the impressions produced upon them by the enterprising agent. . . .

"Disability insurance has reached a point where it can be safely undertaken by a conservative company, but no teacher should mislead himself into believing that the income he can expect in the case of such disability is comparable to the scale of pensions which have been paid by the Carnegie Foundation and by our stronger universities."

Insurance Without the Agent.—"The Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association is engaged in the interesting experience of determining how far, with a special group of highly intelligent people, the duty of insurance and of old age protection can be made a customary feature of the economic life of the group. . . . Nevertheless, it will remain true for many years that even among groups of teachers and notwithstanding the evident advantages which the teacher enjoys in having access to the Association's policies, the agent of the commercial company will oftentimes be

able to sell his wares more successfully by personal solicitation than the Association can do by a mere presentation of the facts on the printed page."

Part IV contains a statement of the agreement made with the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association by Bowdoin, Brown, Bryn Mawr, Grinnell, Knox, Rochester, Tulane, Union, Whitman, Williams, and the Worcester Polytechnic Institute. In nearly all cases the plan is optional with the teachers.

Part V ends with a discussion of industrial pensions and group insurance.

MEMBERSHIP

MEMBERS ELECTED

The Committee on Admissions announces the election of one hundred and one members, as follows:

Carthage College, A. H. Arbaugh, M. E. Chapin, W. K. Hill, Letta Simmons, W. C. Spielman, C. A. Van Velzer, J. H. Voss, H. W. Whitten; **University of Chicago**, H. E. Gronow; **University of Cincinnati**, D. E. Jackson; **Dartmouth College**, E. D. Elston, F. P. Lord, W. E. Montsie, L. F. Murch, J. P. Richardson; **Drury College**, J. T. Williams; **Illinois College**, W. S. Leavenworth, F. I. Moats, Hilda M. Raetzmann; **Miami University**, C. E. Carter, B. M. Davis, T. L. Harris; **Mills College**, Vernette L. Gibbons; **University of Minnesota**, H. S. Cannon, Hal Downey, C. A. Moore, Ruth S. Phelps; **Morningside College**, J. J. Hayes; **University of North Carolina**, J. M. Bell, J. M. Booker, E. C. Branson, J. H. Hanford, S. E. Leavitt, A. H. Patterson, W. F. Prouty, Oliver Towles; **North Dakota Agricultural College**, I. W. Smith; **Northwestern University**, H. S. Philbrick; **Ohio State University**, Grace M. Bareis, H. M. Beatty, J. E. Boyd, V. B. Caris, F. R. Castleman, A. C. Cole, U. W. Denman, E. P. Durrant, Clair A. Dye, B. A. Eisenlohr, Sada A. Harbarger, E. F. Lowry, F. E. Lumley, Vera McC. Masters, W. J. McCaughey, C. C. McCracken, J. H. Nichols, Milton Percival, Gertrude L. Robinson, H. S. Stuckert, May Thomas, G. R. Twiss, E. L. Usry, J. H. Weaver, G. A. Wood; **Princeton University**, H. B. Dewing, William Koren, Alexander Russell; **Purdue University**, H. F. Fore, Amy Howe, N. A. Kellogg, W. A. Knapp, Marguerita Mallon, C. K. Robbins, W. A. Zehring; **Reed College**, George Rebec; **Rutgers College**, E. F. Hauch; **University of South Dakota**, Edith M. Beaumont; **University of Tennessee**, H. C. Fortner; **Tufts College**, T. E. Mergendahl; **Vassar College**, Louise D. Dennis, Grace Medes, Alice D. Snyder; **University of Vermont**, F. D. Carpenter, J. I. Lindsay; **Virginia Polytechnic Institute**, W. E. Barlow, T. B. Campbell, W. B. Coggin, D. S. Lancaster,

C. M. Newman, H. L. Price, J. E. Williams; **Washburn College**, J. A. Aldrich; **Western Reserve University**, Eleanor Ferris, C. E. Gehlke, J. E. Hyde, Anna H. Palmié, Lynn Thorndike; **Williams College**, J. S. Galbraith; **University of Wisconsin**, Friedrich Bruns, E. H. Gardner, B. Q. Morgan; **Yale University**, S. T. Williams.

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following one hundred and thirty-three nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions* and will be considered by the Committee if received before August 1, 1920.

The Committee on Admissions* consists of J. V. Denney (Ohio State), Chairman; Florence Bascom (Bryn Mawr), Edward Capps (Princeton), J. Q. Dealey (Brown), A. R. Hohlfeld (Wisconsin), G. H. Marx (Stanford), and F. C. Woodward (Chicago).

Isaac E. Ash (Economics), Ohio (Athens)
Robert Lacey Berger (Mathematics), Ohio (Athens)
W. C. Brinkley (Government), Texas
A. E. Brainerd (Geology), Syracuse
R. Granville Campbell (Politics), Washington and Lee
Clarence M. Case (Sociology), Iowa
Rudolf A. Clemen (Economics), Northwestern
Paul D. Converse (Commerce), Pittsburgh
Guy W. Conrey (Agriculture), Ohio State
William Franklin Copeland (Agriculture), Ohio (Athens)
Sidney N. Deane (Greek), Smith
Lucius Junius Desha (Chemistry), Washington and Lee
Lillian E. Dimmitt (Ancient Languages), Morningside
Thomas J. Farrar (German), Washington and Lee
Merton C. Ferson (Law), George Washington
Leslie E. Fuller (Old Testament), Northwestern
John Greene (Latin), Colgate

* Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Mass. Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

Laurenz Greene (Horticulture), Purdue
Clyde Leclare Grose (History), Northwestern
William G. Hale (Law), Oregon
W. S. Hendrixson (Chemistry), Grinnell
Victor Dwight Hill (Greek), Ohio (Athens)
George N. Hoffer (Botany), Purdue
Davenport Hooker (Anatomy), Pittsburgh
Thomas N. Hoover (History), Ohio (Athens)
James W. Kern (Latin), Washington and Lee
Montfort Jones (Economics), Pittsburgh
Joseph R. Long (Law), Washington and Lee
Julius A. W. Luck (Chemistry), Howard College
M. K. McKay (Economics), Pittsburgh
Clinton N. Mackinnon (English), Ohio (Athens)
S. K. Mardis (Rural Education), Ohio (Athens)
William Alderman Matheny (Botany), Ohio (Athens)
Kirtley F. Mather (Geology), Denison
G. E. McLaughlin (Industrial Education), Ohio (Athens)
Wilson T. Moog (Music), Smith
Agnes Fay Morgan (Household Science), California
Joshua R. Morton (Chemistry), Ohio (Athens)
H. J. Muller (Zoology), Texas
Mary T. Noss (Romance Languages), Ohio (Athens)
Herbert Patterson (Education), Oklahoma Agricultural
H. H. Peckham (English), Purdue
Louis Pelzer (History), Iowa
Mary Edith Pinney (Biology), Lake Erie
J. W. H. Pollard (Hygiene), Washington and Lee
Charles Reitell (Engineering), Pittsburgh
Franklin L. Riley (History), Washington and Lee
E. C. Robbins (Commerce), Oregon
Edgar E. Robinson (History), Stanford
W. J. Rusk (Mathematics), Grinnell
A. J. Schneeweiss (Philosophy), Pittsburgh
Edgar F. Shannon (English), Washington and Lee
James Huntley Sinclair (Psychology), Smith
Elmer W. Smith (English), Colgate
Livingston W. Smith (Mathematics), Washington and Lee
W. Leigh Sowers (English), Texas

W. LeConte Stevens (Physics), Washington and Lee
Jacob Swart (Business Administration), Colorado College
Joshua Irving Tracey (Mathematics), Yale
Robert H. Tucker (Economics), Washington and Lee
H. Edward Wells (Chemistry), Smith
Hiram R. Wilson (English), Ohio (Athens)

William Anderson (Political Science), Minnesota
Gordon Nelson Armstrong (Mathematics), Ohio Wesleyan
William J. Baerg (Entomology), Arkansas
Joanna Baker (Latin and Greek), Lake Erie
Gilbert H. Barnes (Economics), Ohio Wesleyan
Frank N. Bryant (Business Administration), Syracuse
Elizabeth B. Bower (Chemistry), Lake Erie
William S. Carpenter (History and Political Science), Princeton
Arthur M. Charles (Languages), Earlham
Erwin O. Christensen (Art), North Dakota
B. J. Clawson (Pathology), North Dakota
A. Harvey Collins (History), Redlands
George Herman Derry (Economics), Union
Ross Aiken Gortner (Agriculture), Minnesota
Frederick W. Grover (Engineering), Union
L. C. Harrington (Mines), North Dakota
John Cunyus Hodges (English), Ohio Wesleyan
Anna F. Holahan (Romance Languages), North Dakota
Jobelle Holcombe (English), Arkansas
William Dana Hoyt (Biology), Washington and Lee
Henry J. Humpstone (Psychology), North Dakota
E. C. Hytree (Chemistry), Ohio Wesleyan
Margaret B. Lawsing (Art), Lake Erie
Sara C. Lovejoy (Home Economics), Lake Erie
J. T. Marshman (Oratory), Ohio Wesleyan
Egbert Ray Nichols (English), Redlands
Leroy S. Palmer (Agriculture), Minnesota
Stella Palmer (Home Economics), Arkansas
Alfred G. Panaroni (Romance Languages), City of New York
Louis A. Pappenhagen (Chemistry), Ohio Wesleyan
John William Read (Chemistry), Arkansas

Frances H. Relf (History), Lake Erie
Elvin C. Stakman (Plant Pathology), Minnesota
Thomas E. Steckel (French), Ohio Wesleyan
W. B. Stelzner (Engineering), Arkansas
Stephen Faunce Sears (English), Mass. Inst. Tech.
Robert M. Smith (English), Drury
T. Townsend Smith (Physics), Nebraska
H. C. Tilton (Economics), Redlands
Arthur B. Turner (Mathematics), City of New York
F. F. Blachley (Government), Oklahoma
Ezra Bowen (Economics), Lafayette
T. H. Brewer (English), Oklahoma
William H. Burger (Engineering), Northwestern
H. E. Cunningham (Philosophy), Oklahoma
Edward Everett Dale (History), Oklahoma
James C. Davis (Mechanics), Oklahoma
Edwin De Barr (Chemistry), Oklahoma
C. E. Decker (Geology), Oklahoma
Homer L. Dodge (Physics), Oklahoma
J. H. Felgar (Engineering), Oklahoma
J. DeLancey Ferguson (English), Ohio Wesleyan
Charles F. Giard (Music), Oklahoma
Avis Gwinn (Home Economics), Oklahoma
Frederick Holmberg (Music), Oklahoma
James Bryant Hopkins (Modern Languages), Lafayette
Wallie Abraham Hurwitz (Mathematics), Cornell
Oscar B. Jacobson (Art), Oklahoma
Isaac Joslin Cox (History), Northwestern
H. E. Marsh (Physics), Redlands
Margaret J. Mitchell (History), Oklahoma
Julien C. Monnet (Law), Oklahoma
Lawrence N. Morgan (English), Oklahoma
L. B. Nice (Physiology), Oklahoma
Fred W. Padgett (Chemistry), Oklahoma
E. R. Sims (Romance Languages), Texas
J. W. Sturgis (Latin), Oklahoma
Louis Alvin Turley (Medicine), Oklahoma
Arthur J. Williams (Geology), Oklahoma
Ella Williams (English), Indiana
Herbert E. Wise (Philosophy), Redlands